



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/658,921

09/10/2003

Thomas M. Kopera

47079-0231

2299

30223

7590

03/19/2008

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
161 N. CLARK STREET  
48TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60601-3213

EXAMINER

TORIMIRO, ADETOKUNBO OLUSEGUN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/19/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/658,921	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOPERA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Adetokunbo O. Torimiro	<b>Art Unit</b> 3714	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Adetokunbo O. Torimiro.

(3) Soroniell Cimppoes.

(2) John Hotaling .

(4) Jeremie Moll ; Scott Massing.

Date of Interview: 12 March 0208.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Various sample pictures of the invention was showed and explained.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Fogelman et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The interview was based on the shape changing feature of the applicant's invention as not being taught by Fogelman et al. Examiner argues that based on the claim as written, Fogelman et al in combination with Hedrick et al teaches it. Applicant as agreed to ammend the claim to better clarify the invention. Examiner will fully and fairly consider the applicant's timely submitted and officially written response to the office..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/John M Hotaling II/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required